

Topeka Scholarship Fund to assist young Hispanics interested in keeping the art form alive.

Bonnie Alcalá, a relative of several original members, described the mariachi as "an extension of the community and a wholesome, beautiful way of saying we are proud of our heritage." Cuevas always believed in the mariachi as a form of cultural preservation and regularly tells audiences the importance of this artistic expression. "My music tells me who I am and where I come from." In her eighties, Cuevas still performs with the group on occasion.

SOURCES: Blankenship, Bill. 1999. "HOLA! KC: Mariachi Spectacular moves to Kansas City from Topeka to hasten goal of erecting a monument to Mariachi Estrella de Topeka." *Topeka Capital-Journal*, October 31; _____. 1998. "Statue will keep memory of mariachi band members alive." *Topeka Capital-Journal*, November 30; Sobrino.Net. (national mariachi website). "A History of Women in Mariachi Music." www.sobrinonet.net/mpc/womenmariachi (accessed July 22, 2005).

Natasha Mercedes Crawford

MARIANISMO AND MACHISMO

The term *marianismo* was coined by political scientist Evelyn P. Stevens in 1973 in her essay "Marianismo: The Other Face of Machismo in Latin America," which appeared in Ann Pescatello's edited work *Female and Male in Latin America*. *Marianismo* derives from the worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Catholic Church. Stevens endows *marianismo* with a historical pedigree that extends back to prehistory and antiquity by citing several fertility goddesses from the Indus civilization, the Fertile Crescent, Crete, and Jewish and Christian cosmology. While the Judeo-Christian cultures successfully eliminated goddesses in the pursuit of patriarchal monotheism, powerful female figures survived and thrived. Early medieval Christianity endorsed the figure of Mary as the mother of Christ at the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. Her growing popularity throughout the Middle Ages and the early modern history of Europe set the stage for a cult that has been dubbed "mariology" by those who support it and "mar-iolatry" by those who criticize it.

Stevens defined *marianismo* as a secular construction affecting women's behavior and made a distinction between the religious cult of Mary and the secular stereotypes that she claimed were common to all Latin American countries. The transition between a religious worship and the adoption of the religious concept to the secular level remained unclear in her essay. In the secular world *marianismo* means that all women are perceived as possessing qualities of "semidivinity, moral superiority, and spiritual strength." The blend of these variables endows women with self-abnegation, humility, and the will-

ingness to sacrifice themselves for their children and tolerate the imperfections of their husbands, to whom they remain submissive. *Marianismo* extends to sexual behavior, and Stevens claimed that it supported the cult of virginity and premarital chastity in women as desirable moral and physical attributes. She echoed popular-culture male attitudes about female behavior during coitus and sexual practices appropriate for each sex that allowed men to have more sexual freedom and boast about their generating abilities. Stevens also endorsed the view that women themselves help to perpetuate these values in their roles as socializers of young boys.

While *marianismo* apparently helped create a negative social atmosphere for women, Stevens argued that by adopting and showing these behavioral characteristics, women gained moral authority and respect that permitted them to exercise spiritual leadership at home and in society. Women could choose models of myth, religion, and ethical norms offered by *marianismo*, surrounded and protected by its cultural "security blanket." By adopting *marianismo* in their behavior, women suffered fewer problems of "personal identity" and were able to cope successfully with some social problems. For example, they could handle male infidelity by being wrapped in their "saintliness" or work outside the home as an act of self-sacrifice or as a choice that did not endanger their motherhood duties. The latter was supported by the availability of servants, a result of the economic imbalances of the region. In sum, *marianismo* was the counterpart of *machismo* and a "reciprocal arrangement" receiving "considerable impetus from women themselves."

Written in the early 1970s and based on personal information and heavy dependence on Mexican sources, Stevens's essay looks superficial and outdated for the twenty-first century. Indeed, it did not necessarily reflect values prevalent in Latin America at the time of its publication and was more an interpretation than a verifiable reality, applicable to some but not all sectors of society. Stevens claimed that among Indians who had preserved their cultural "purity" *marianismo* and *machismo* were irrelevant. Stevens acknowledged that *marianismo*-*machismo* constraints could be circumvented by personal choice. The adoption of *marianismo* by all women was highly questionable.

Despite its apparent methodological and interpretive weaknesses, *marianismo* gained wide popularity and acceptance among academic and popular-culture circles as a theoretical model for understanding the social and personal traits of women and their history in Latin America. *Marianismo* was somewhat aided by Elsa Chaney's popularization of the concept of *supermadre*, the extension of the role of mother to the public arena and especially politics. Women, she argued, use

Marshall, Guadalupe

their role of mothers (with all the spiritual values attached to it by *marianismo*) to carve for themselves a public persona when activism in politics demands it. Both the *marianismo* and the *supermadre* concepts implied the projection of female characteristics into social behavior accepted by tradition and acceptable to both genders.

The surge of feminist movements and groups in Latin America since the late 1970s has challenged Stevens's *marianismo* concept as sketchy at best, and in need of more solid research. A wealth of more finely tuned historical, anthropological, and sociological studies have explored the structural characteristics of patriarchal ideology throughout centuries and the intersection of class, race, sexual orientation, education, and religion in the definition of gender as a social construct. Using a variety of tools, contemporary analysts suggest that the stereotyping of male and female roles in society is a process that responds to a variety of circumstances and, therefore, is historically sensitive. Legislation, education, and economic development affect the roles of women and men in society. Icons of femininity and masculinity are not homogeneous or perpetually hegemonic. Women may achieve authority and power within male-oriented societies and resist patriarchal modes of domination. Equally, not all men wish submission in women. Nonetheless, maternal roles encouraged in women by church and state have been, and remain, relevant in the discussion of socioeconomic and political issues, in the shaping of state policies, and in the mobilization of women themselves. "Maternalismo" is preferred to "*marianismo*" in defining the ideologies that still sublimate the role of women as mothers and paragons of distinctive female values. While maternalism may not be the ultimate nomenclature for these phenomena, it avoids the pitfalls in the original definition of *marianismo* by avoiding its religious connotation.

The original definition of *marianismo* necessitated a counterpart in terms of male behavior, and by the 1970s machismo had begun to receive continental attention as a Latin American cultural trait. According to Stevens, machismo was a set of values and behavior that existed prior to *marianismo* but in essential symbiosis with it. She succinctly defined machismo as "the cult of virility." Following sociologist Samuel Ramos's interpretation of Mexican culture, Stevens argued that machismo was a degeneration of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century upper-class attitudes brought to the New World by the conquistadores and gaining in strength and validity throughout time. Mid-twentieth-century sociological and psychological studies defined it largely as a behavioral expression of values held by lower-class men. More recent analyses defined machismo as a universal expression of male authority

and domination applicable to all men who show similar behavior. Among *machismo's* assumed variety of behavioral signifiers are the desire to prove sexual potency and male strength through boastful enforcement of power, aggressiveness toward other men and women, expectation of female submissiveness, and the belief in the superiority of men over women. A strong critic of such generalizations, Puerto Rican sociologist Rafael Ramírez has suggested that such traits are "acts of behavior that manifest class positions and are survival mechanisms used by the least powerful men in class societies" and ignore the special social and historic context in which they are expressed. The study of machismo should be replaced by the study of masculinity as a complex set of values inculcated since childhood, culturally and class specific, and not always or exclusively oriented toward women. Latin American ideals of masculinity should not be stereotyped as simply *machista*, because they include positive values of responsibility. National, regional, and even racial or ethnic variations of masculinity can be expected, as well as changes in its definition throughout history. In his study of contemporary gender culture in a poor neighborhood in Mexico City, Matthew C. Gutmann explored male and female self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity, fathering, mothering, and sex and raised doubts about stereotypes long held as truisms by uncritical writers. He argued that *machismo* is a recent cultural construct, partly of foreign origin and undermined by constant challenges from within. Despite these criticisms, *machismo* in its variety of definitions continues to be used as an analytical tool implying negative values and behavior in men. Pathological *machismo* may be under indictment, but patriarchal values still shape Latin American societies. As a key to understanding cultural gender traits, *marianismo* and *machismo*, despite their questionable value, continue to be used and abused as analytical tools.

SOURCES: Chaney, Elsa. 1979. *Supermadre: Women in Politics in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press; Gutmann, Matthew C. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press; Ramírez, Rafael L. 1999. *What It Means to Be a Man: Reflections of Puerto Rican Masculinity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press; Stevens, Evelyn P. 1973. "Marianismo: The Other Face of Machismo in Latin America." In *Female and Male in Latin America: Essays*, ed. Ann Pescatello, 89–102. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Asunción Lavrin

MARSHALL, GUADALUPE (1906–)

In May 1937 Guadalupe (Lupe) Marshall, a Mexican labor activist in Chicago, wandered dazed through a crowd of steelworkers on strike, strike supporters, po-